DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 297 TM 001 308

AUTHOR Reinhard, Diane L.
TITLE Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-1-0857
PUB DATE 31 Aug 71
GRANT OEG-0-71-4558
NOTE 11p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Evaluation; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Personnel Selection; *Planning; *Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Program Planning; Systems Approach; *Systems Development

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the work performed in the project, and introduces the substantive results of the project, which are presented in the form of two separate advocate team reports that propose strategies for a planning and assessment system. The administrative summary consists of five sections: I. Description of Original Proposal and Revised Scope of Work, Including Personnel; II. Selection of Advocate Team Members; III. Orientation Session; IV. Advocate Team Writing Sessions; and V. Recommendations.
(Author/DB)

ED 091297

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 1-0857

Grant No. OEG-0-71-4558

Diane L. Reinhard

The Ohio State University Research Foundation

1314 Kinnear Road

Columbus, Ohio 43212

DESIGN OF A PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM FOR THE DIVISION OF MANPOWER AND INSTITUTIONS

August 31, 1971

TM 001 308

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 1-0857
Contract No. OEG-0-71-4558

DESIGN OF A PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM FOR THE DIVISION OF MANPOWER AND INSTITUTIONS

Diane L. Reinhard
The Ohio State University Research Foundation
1314 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

August 31, 1971

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

Introduction

This report summarizes the work performed in the project entitled, "Design of Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions," and introduces the substantive results of the project which are presented in the form of two separate advocate team reports that propose strategies for a planning and assessment system.

The administrative summary which follows consists of five sections:

I. Description of Original Proposal and Revised Scope of Work, Including Personnel.

II. Selection of Advocate Team Members.

III. Orientation Session.

IV. Advocate Team Writing Sessions.

V. Recommendations.

I. Description of Original Proposal and Revised Scope of Work.
On June 18, 1970, The Ohio State University Research Foundation submitted to the U.S. Office of Education a proposal initiated by Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Director of the Evaluation Center at Ohio State. The proposal was entitled, "Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions (DMI)."

The proposal, which was to span a period of six and one-half months (June 15 to December 30, 1971) consisted of the following objectives:

1. Completing a background study that would lay out the characteristics, needs, and opportunities of the new planning, management, and assessment system of the Division of Manpower and Institutions.

2. Preparing a detailed specification for the design of the new system.

3. Designing two alternative planning and assessment systems, complete with detailed specifications for all needed instrumentation.

4. Selecting or synthesizing the final system.

5. Completing pilot instrumentation according to the specifications

6. Orienting DMI staff to the new system.

Procedures for achieving these objectives were elaborated into a series of twenty-seven steps; however, the funding for the initial proposal (which was to be followed by a continuation proposal) was requested only in terms of the first nine steps, as follows:

1. Report #1: clarification of background evaluation questions (needs for the new system, characteristics of present system)

2. Confirmation of background evaluation questions

3. Report #2: completion of background evaluation design

4. Recruitment of Advocate and Convergence Teams

5. Review of background evaluation design

6. Implementation of the background evaluation

7. Report #3: background evaluation findings

8. Consultation as needed by the DMI staff regarding the implementation of their present evaluation system while a new one is under development

9. Report #4: DMI evaluation objectives and alternatives evaluation specifications

These steps were altered following a meeting with the National Center for Educational Research and Development/personnel when it was revealed that the time schedule (6-$\frac{1}{2}$ months) for completing all 27 steps would not result in an evaluation system that could be implemented in time to service important decisions of NCERD.

To meet NCERD needs, the time schedule and tasks were compressed into a two-month sequence. A brief description of the revised scope of work for this grant of two months was presented in a letter to Ray Rackley, Program Monitor in DMI, and a copy of this letter was also sent to Theresa Diorio of the Contract Office. The pertinent section of this letter concerning the revised scope of the work is provided below.

> Essentially the scope of work for the two months from June 28 to August 28 will incorporate certain activities from the original proposal

submitted with the six and one-half month time frame. A brief description of activities involved is provided below.

1. Members of DMI will prepare the background study to be used by the advocate teams.

2. OSU will recruit and orient two advocate teams. The orientation session will last three days. After an intervening period of time, the two teams will reconvene for a writing session of five days.

3. The two evaluation strategies developed by the advocate teams will be presented to the Office of Education by September 1, 1971.

It is understood that the amount of money for Phase I (2 months) $24,440, will remain the same. It is also understood that any follow-up grants will take into consideration activities which have been completed during the first phase.

Project personnel from The Ohio State University for the revised scope of work included Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Project Supervisor (10% time for two months); Diane Reinhard, Project Manager, (100% time for two months); and a secretary (100% time for two months).

II. Selection of Advocate Team Members. The revised scope of work called for recruiting two advocate teams, each of which would separately develop an evaluation design for DMI.

Michael Scriven and Daniel L. Stufflebeam were solicited and each agreed to chair one of the teams. The composition of their teams included:

Michael Scriven, Chairman
University of California at Berkeley

Gene V. Glass
University of Colorado

Wells Hively
University of Minnesota

Robert E. Stake
University of Illinois

Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Chairman
The Ohio State University

Henry M. Brickell
Institute for Educational Development
New York, New York

Egon G. Guba
Indiana University

William B. Michael
University of Southern California

The teams are noteworthy for the high caliber professional people who agreed to serve.

Since the evaluation system for which these two teams were to devise a strategy concerned the Educational Labs and R&D Centers, it was decided that a representative from the labs and from the R&D Centers should be invited to serve as consultants to the advocate teams.

John L. Holland of the Center for Social Organization of Schools and Richard E. Schutz of the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development agreed to serve as consultants to the advocate team chaired by Michael Scriven. Max G. Abbott of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration and Robert S. Randall of Southwest Educational Development Laboratory consented to serve as consultants for the advocate team chaired by Daniel Stufflebeam.

III. Orientation Session. On July 24, 1971, an orientation session was held in Washington, D.C., for all advocate members and consultants. The purpose of this meeting was to provide background data and answer any questions team members or consultants had regarding their task. While a three day orientation session had been projected, feasibility constraints allowed only a one-day session.

In planning for this session, the project manager at OSU and the project monitor from the Office of Education worked closely together. They compiled questions that advocate team members wished to have answered at the session and forwarded them to relevant persons within NCERD. Advocate team members were also asked to identify documents needed to assist them in their task of developing evaluation strategies.

A compilation of documents resulted from the orientation session planning effort, and each advocate team member was given a packet of materials which included:

1. Lab and Center Background:

   Schmidtlein, Frank. A Status Report on the National Program of Educational Laboratories,

R&D Centers and Related R&D Institutions Administered by the Division of Manpower and Institutions. April 12, 1971.

Brickell, Henry M. Testimony Before the Subcommittee on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate. March 30, 1971.

Chase, Francis. Educational Research and Development in the Sixties: The Mixed Report Card. Submitted to the Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives. April, 1971.

2. Recent and current reporting guidelines and PGIS Information:

Centers:

Guidelines for FY 71 Program Plan and Budget Request (PRDB). July 24, 1970.

Annual Report Guidelines. June 1, 1970.

Guidelines for Quarterly Progress Reports. May 13, 1970.

Laboratories:

Program Guidelines: Contractor's Request for Continued Funding (CRCF) July 1970 Revision.

Program Guidelines: Basic Program Plans. July 1, 1969.

National Program on Early Childhood Education:

Contractor's Request for Continued Funding. June 25, 1970.

Instruction's for September 15 Report Budget Materials. August 5, 1970.

Centers and Laboratories:

DRAFT: Information and Instructions for submittal of the Basic Program

Plan; Educational Laboratories, Research and Development Centers. June 17, 1971.

DRAFT: FY 1972 Interim Guidelines for Annual Budget Justification (ABJ); Division of Manpower and Institutions. July 17, 1971.

PGIS:

Viehoever, Kent. Position Paper on the Project Grant Information System (PGIS) and the Division of Manpower and Institutions. April 14, 1971.

3. Documents furnished to DMI by the Centers and Laboratories in response to the guidelines of paragraph 3 (above):

   The most recent Basic Program Plan, Contractor's Request for Continued Funding, or Program Plan and Budget Request from each of the institutions sponsored by DMI.

4. Papers relating to the contract for the design of a new planning and assessment system for DMI:

   Stufflebeam, Daniel L. Proposal: Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. June 18, 1971.

   Rackley, W. Ray and Reinhard, Diane L. Charge to the Advocate Teams. Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. July 9, 1970.

   Rackley, W. Ray. Memo to Dr. Silberman: Major Steps in the Design of the DMI Evaluation System. June 29, 1971.

5. Selection of information on product evaluation.

6. Selection of information used to guide site visit teams.

A charge to the advocate team was also developed. It reads as follows:

Given

1. Criteria for an institutional support policy and associated assessment pro-

cedures for the Division of Manpower and Institutions (Cf. Frye, June 3, 1971,pp.3-5),

2. A support policy and associated assessment procedures which meet the criteria (Cf. Frye, above), and

3. A statement of the ten types of decisions included in the new support policy and associated assessment procedures (Cf. Rackley, June 18, 1971, pp. 2-4),

design an assessment system which will enable DMI leaders to make responsible decisions in regard to the institutions and programs which they support.

The design will specify all steps and procedures leading up to each of the ten decisions, including:

1. A statement of the criteria to be used in making the decisions,

2. A description of the assessment information needed to make the specified decisions,

3. A statement of how the information will be obtained, processed, interpreted and used by DMI decision makers,

4. A statement of who will participate in the assessment activities, including the responsibilities and qualifications needed for each position,

5. Outlines or specifications of instruments to be used,

6. A statement of the conceptual, precedural, and organizational unity or integration of the ten types of reviews or decisions,

7. A projected budget, and

8. Recommendations for installing the system, including completion of instruments, training of staff, etc.

The report submitted by each team will include, further, a narrative walk-through of how each of the ten reviews is to be conducted.

The orientation session itself began with the presentation by Harry Silberman, Associate Commissioner of NCERD. This was followed by a discussion of the "Support Policy" paper dated June 3, 1971, with Chuck Frye answering questions that were posed concerning it. The remainder of the morning and the first part of the afternoon were spent in discussion of questions generated by the advocate team members. Questions were addressed to the following OE personnel who attended the session:

Charles Frye, Director, DMI
Greta Gibson, Program Specialist
Sarah Gideonse, Program Specialist
Susan Gruskin, Program Specialist
Bruce Hawkinson, Product Diffusion Officer
Joseph Lipson, Program Planner, Commissioner's Planning Unit for the National Institute of Education
Ward Mason, Chief, Program Operations Branch, DMI
Ernest Michelson, Deputy Director, DMI
Ray Rackley, Leader, Program Review Team
Harry Silberman, Associate Commissioner, NCERD
Kent Viehoever, Leader, Reports and Analysis Team

In addition to the NCERD persons, Dr. Francis Chase, an authority on Educational Laboratories and R&D Centers, served as a consultant for the day.

During the latter half of the afternoon, each advocate team met separately to discuss individual concerns and talk with Office of Education resource persons.

All members of the teams and the consultants were able to attend this session except Robert Stake, who had a prior commitment. Therefore, Diane Reinhard traveled to CIRCE at the University of Illinois on August 10 to orient him by answering questions and providing documents.

Finally, transcripts of the orientation session were sent to advocate team members and their consultants prior to their convening for the writing sessions. Team members also received a sample of site visit reports which had had identifying information on names of institutions and site reviewers deleted.

IV. Advocate Team Writing Sessions. The chairman of the advocate teams were permitted to select the site for their conference writing session. They were offered the services of a technical writer or stenographer and they were provided any needed equipment (typewriters, dictating machines, Xerox facilities) at the site of their meeting. Each team was also allocated an amount of money to be spent following the writing session for editorial work or additional consultant time for the chairman of the teams.

The advocate team chaired by Daniel Stufflebeam met August 5-9 at Phoenix, Arizona, Del Webb Towne House. The product of this meeting is presented in the accompnaying Advocate Team Report entitled "Design for Evaluating Institutions and Programs."

The advocate team chaired by Michael Scriven met for its writing session, August 18-21 at Santa Barbara, California, Santa Barbara Biltmore. The product of this meeting is presented in the accompanying report entitled "An Evaluation System for Labs and R&D Centers."

Both Project Manager Diane Reinhard and Project Monitor Ray Rackley attended both sessions. Ray Rackley brought additional documents (ie., reports from all of the institutions) for advocate team members to utilize if they wished.

Since the idea of utilizing advocate teams was for the purpose of obtaining two different strategies, special care was taken by Reinhard and Rackley not to have the proceedings of the first advocate team influence or contaminate in any way the proceedings of the second session.

V. Recommendations. First, it is recommended that the decision makers in Division of Research and Development Resources (previously known as DMI), NCERD, obtain judgements of the two strategies generated by the two advocate teams from an external group.

Second, it is furthur recommended that the chairman of each advocate team be summoned to Washington to answer any questions that the decision makers may personally have regarding each strategy.

Third, following a decision between the strategies, it is recommended that DRDR attempt in every way possible to put into operation the selected strategy.